


# OF

## AD A103437



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1964 AV



### LEVEL TO

#### SKILLED FINGER MOVEMENTS IN TYPING

Donald R. Gentner





#### CENTER FOR HUMAN INFORMATION PROCESSING



The research reported here was conducted under Contract N00014-19-C0323, NR 157-497 with the Personnel and Training Research Programs of the Office of Naval Research, and was sponsored by the Office of Naval Research and the Ap Force Office of Scientific Research. The views and conclusions contained to this socument are those of the author and should not be interpreted at necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed of implied, of the sponsoring agencies. Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction to whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government. ONR REPORT 8103

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093 CHIP 104 JULY 1961

80 8 28 016

CHIP Report 104

July 1981

Skilled Finger Movements in Typing

Donald R. Gentner

Program in Cognitive Science
University of California, San Diego



Copyright © 1981 Donald R. Gentner

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Center for Human Information Processing, C-009
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093

$\overline{\Box}$
Codes
/or

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUM	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM		
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCE		J. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	TW-AI	103	431
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)		19	3. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD GOVERED
Skilled Finger Movem	ents in Typing	1	Technical Report
		(14	Chip-104, 8103
7. AUTHOR(e)			A. CONTAGE OF GRANT NUMBER(*)
Donald R. Gentner		(13)	N00014-79-C-0323
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME		<del></del>	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Center for Human Info University of Califo		/	NR 157-437
La Jolla, California			12 REPORT DATE
Personnel and Traini	ng Research Programs	(11	July 1981
Office of Naval Rese Arlington, Virginia	arch (Code 458) 22217	·	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & AO	ORESS(II different from Controlling	Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
			Unclassified
			15a, OECLASSIFICATION/OOWNGRAOING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (al this	Report)		L
Approved for public	release; distributio	n unli	mited.
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the	ebetrect entered in Block 20, if di	lferent fro	m Report)
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
IS. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
	lso supported by the	Air Fo	orce Office of
Scientific Research.			
19. KEY WOROS (Continue on reverse etd.	Il necessary and identify by bloc	k number)	
Typing	Movement		
Motor Control	Latency		
Skill	Individual Diff	erence	s
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side	ti necessary and identify by block	t number)	
	OVER		
	OVER		*20 1)

DD 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED BECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Dote Entered)

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

Abstract

Six skilled typists were studied while they transcribed English text. The typists showed stable patterns of performance, but with significant individual differences among the typists. Inter-keypress latencies for 2-finger digraphs (typed by two fingers on the same hand) were particularly variable among typists. Two typists showed large differences in 2-finger digraph latencies, but similar overall typing speeds. Finger movement trajectories, determined from analysis of videotapes of these typists, indicated that the differences in 2-finger digraph latencies correspond to differences in the independence of within-hand finger movements. A high-speed film of one typist showed that finger movements of this typist almost always overlapped. The starting times of movements were six times as variable as the ending times, suggesting that it is the completion rather than the initiation of the movements that is controlled in skilled typing. These studies demonstrate the importance of considering individual differences in constructing a theory of skilled human performance, even in a highly automatized task such as transcription typing.

#### Skilled Finger Movements in Typing

Donald R. Gentner
Center for Human Information Processing
University of California, San Diego

Rapid, precise, malleable motor activity as demonstrated in speech and manual tasks is an important human characteristic. Because it is an extremely rapid skill and has a well defined output, typewriting has been the subject of speculation and some investigation (Lashley, 1959; Shaffer, 1973; Sternberg, Monsell, Knoll, & Wright, 1973; Terzuolo & Viviani, 1980). Typing has typically been thought of as a sequential, automatic process, and the corresponding models of performance involve a series of motor commands, often one for each letter, which are placed in a buffer and then sequentially executed. These models have been based primarily on records of the inter-keypress latencies (Sternberg et al., 1973; Shaffer, 1976).

This paper presents several studies of the transcription of normal English prose by expert typists. In addition to collecting inter-keypress latencies, high-speed film and videotapes were analyzed to determine the actual finger movements used by skilled typists.

#### Inter-Keypress Latencies

Although the keypresses of skilled typists are remarkably rapid and regular, there is still considerable variation in the inter-keypress latencies. The primary determinant of the inter-keypress latency for typing a given letter is the previously typed letter. This section examines the systematic variation in inter-keypress latencies as a function of the previous letter: the digraph latencies.

Eileen Conway assisted with the experimental studies and data analysis reported here. Jonathan Grudin collaborated in the high-speed film study and was a participant in many helpful discussions. The simulation model of typing was developed by David E. Rumelhart. I thank Donald A. Norman for his insightful comments on the manuscript.

This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research, Personnel and Training Research Programs and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, and was monitored by ONR under Contract NOO014-79-C-0323, NR 157-437.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Donald R. Gentner; Center for Human Information Processing, C-009; University of California, San Diego; La Jolla, California, 92093, USA.

#### Method

Six professional typists transcribed normal English prose, typing on a high-quality electronic keyboard (Microswitch model 51SD12-4) with "tactile feel" and a keyboard layout identical to that of the normal IBM Selectric typewriter. All typists frequently typed on a Selectric typewriter. The typed letters were displayed on a CRT in front of the typist.

The text was adapted from a Reader's Digest article on diets (Bayrd, 1979); it will be referred to as the "diet text." The text was approximately 12,000 characters long and was presented as double-spaced, typewritten copy. After a 10 minute warmup with another text, the typists were asked to type the diet text at their normal, rapid rate, without correcting errors.

Keypresses and the corresponding times were recorded by a microcomputer. The typists' hands were videotaped during the experimental session. Analysis of the videotapes is reported later in this paper.

#### Digraph Latencies

The digraphs can be divided into three groups: 1-finger digraphs such as de, where two successive letters are typed by the same finger and there is no possibility of overlapping the movements to strike the first and second keys; 2-finger digraphs such as re, that involve movements by two fingers on the same hand; and 2-hand digraphs such as le, that involve movements on two different hands. Table 1 gives the median latencies of 1-finger, 2-finger, and 2-hand digraphs for the six typists. For every typist, 1-finger digraphs were typed slowest, 2-finger digraphs were intermediate, and 2-hand digraphs were typed fastest. As shown by the standard deviations in Table 1, latencies for 2-finger digraphs were most variable among typists. This finding is in accord with a study of individual differences in keystroke timing (Gaines, Lisowski, Press, & Shapiro, 1980) reporting that people were best differentiated by the digraphs in, io, no, on, and ul, all 2-finger digraphs. The typists also differ significantly when the latency for 2-finger digraphs is compared to the latencies for 1-finger and 2-hand digraphs. If the difference between 1-finger and 2-hand latencies is taken to represent 100% of the savings resulting from the possibility of overlapping movements, the percent of savings seen in the 2-finger latencies ranges from 28% for typist 3 and 30% for typist 5 to 90% for typist 1 and 97% for typist 6. Because typist 3 and typist 6 represent the extremes in the amount of savings for 2-finger digraphs but had similar overall typing rates (76 words/min for typist 3 and 82 words/min for typist 6), I will concentrate the remaining analysis on these two typists. On most measures, the other typists show intermediate performance.

Letter-Letter Digraphs

Typist	Median Latency (msec)							
	Overall	1-finger	2-finger	2-hand	Savings <sup>a</sup>			
1	114	180	103	94	90%			
2	160	225	176	132	52%			
3	128	164	147	103	28%			
4	135	167	132	115	67%			
5	181	209	190	145	30%			
5 6	129	176	119	1 17	97%			
s.d.	24.7	24.6	33.5	18.6				

asavings = 1-finger latency - 2-finger latency 1-finger latency - 2-hand latency

0

The differences in median latencies of the digraph types are reflected in the distributions of individual latencies. The distributions of digraph latencies for typist 3 and typist 6 are shown in Figures 1 and 2. For typist 3, the 2-finger digraphs were most similar to the 1-finger digraphs. Typist 6 shows a completely different pattern; the 2-finger digraphs were almost identical to 2-hand digraphs. Figure 3 presents a more detailed comparison of the 77 highest frequency digraphs for typists 3 and 6. Typist 3 was faster on 1-finger and 2-hand digraphs and typist 6 was faster on 2-finger digraphs.

#### Comparison with Simulation Model

Rumelhart and Norman (1981) have developed a computer model of a typist that simulates the finger movements during typing. In the simulation model several letters in the text and their corresponding fingers are simultaneously activated. Depending on the geometry of the keyboard and the physical constraints of the fingers and hands, the movement to type one letter may be aided or hindered by movements to type other letters. The inter-keypress latencies are determined by the resolution of these interactions. Figure 4 compares the digraph latencies produced by the simulation model with the average digraph latencies for all six typists. Although the correspondence between the simulation model and typists is fairly good (correlation coefficient = 0.78), a major discrepancy stands out. The typists have a wide range of latencies for 2-finger digraphs, but the simulation model types all 2-finger digraphs at essentially the same rate. The basis for this variation in digraph latencies on the part of our typists is not clear at this point, although the simulation results indicate that a simple competition between letters to be typed is not sufficient.

#### Comparison of Finger Movements for Typists 3 and 6

All six typists were faster when typing 2-hand digraphs than when typing 1-finger digraphs. Because there is no possibility of overlapping the successive keystrokes in 1-finger digraphs and because typists have been observed to overlap keystrokes with 2-hand digraphs (Olsen & Murray, 1976; Gentner, Grudin, & Conway, 1980), the shorter latency of 2-hand digraphs has been attributed to overlapped movements. This perspective suggests that the variation in relative latency of 2-finger digraphs could be caused by a variation in different typists' ability to overlap movements within a hand. To examine this hypothesis, I compared keystrokes of typists 3 and 6 for 2-finger digraphs with their keystrokes for 2-hand digraphs.

#### Method

While the typists were transcribing the diet text in the previous experiment, their finger movements were recorded on videotape using a Sony RSC 1050 Rotary Shutter Camera. A mirror mounted at the top of the keyboard at a 45-degree angle allowed simultaneous recording of two views of the typist's fingers (normal and parallel to the plane of the keyboard). The video fields, recorded every 16.7 msec, were serially




Figure 1. The distributions of all lower case letter-letter digraph latencies for typist 3. The latencies for 1-finger digraphs (n=669, median = 164 msec) were generally longer than for 2-hand digraphs (n=3926, median = 103). The latency distribution for 2-finger digraphs (n=3029, median = 147) was most similar to that for 1-finger digraphs.




Figure 2. The distributions of all lower case letter-letter digraph latencies for typist 6. The latencies for 1-finger digraphs (n=668, median = 176 msec) were generally longer than for 2-hand digraphs (n=3875. median = 117). In contrast to typist 3, however, the latency distribution for 2-finger digraphs (n=2960, median = 119) was almost identical to that for 2-hand digraphs.




Figure 3. Comparison of the median latencies of the 77 highest frequency digraphs for typists 3 and 6. Digraphs plotted below the diagonal line were typed faster by typist 3, while those above the diagonal were typed faster by typist 6. Although typist 3 was faster with 1-finger and 2-hand digraphs, typist 6 was faster with 2-finger digraphs. Their overall typing rates were similar.




Figure 4. Comparison of digraph latencies produced by a computer simulation model of a typist and the average of the median digraph latencies of six skilled typists. The latencies for the simulation are plotted in arbitrary time units.

numbered with an electronic video counter enabling them to be individually analyzed, field-by-field, with a Sony SVM 1010 Video Motion Analyzer. Finger coordinates were digitized from a video monitor with the aid of a light pen. These coordinates were used to calculate the successive positions of the fingertip in 3-dimensional space.

Four digraphs were selected for detailed analysis. Examples were chosen to contrast 2-finger and 2-hand digraphs in identical contexts. For example, the finger trajectories while typing in in things (a 2-finger digraph) were compared with the trajectories while typing en in calisthenics (a 2-hand digraph). The observed latencies for the examples chosen were within seven msec of the median latency for that digraph and typist.

#### Finger Trajectories

Table 2 summarizes the results of the videotape analysis comparing the digraphs en and in. Note that the finger of typist 3 traveled further than the finger of typist 6 between the time the e and n were struck, but this was more than compensated for by the higher speed of typist 3. The difference in path lengths was even greater with the digraph in, but the ratio of speeds did not change and the net effect is that typist 3 had a longer latency than typist 6 for the 2-finger digraph.

Typical trajectories are shown in Figure 5 for the sequences hen and hin. The critical difference between the two typists was in the independence of their finger movements. Consider the two sequences hen and hin. The h and n are both typed with the right index finger (h is on the home row, n is on the bottom row); e is typed by the left hand; i is typed by the right middle finger on the top row. When typing hen both typists struck the h on the home row with their right index finger and then moved that same finger down to the lower row to type the n while the e was being struck by the other hand. When typist 3 typed hin, however, the right index finger moved up towards the top row along with the right middle finger, while the middle finger struck the i key. Typist 6 was quite different, in that the index finger hardly moved while the middle finger pressed the i on the top row. This contrast was observed in all cases of en and in digraphs that were analyzed. Thus typist 3 coupled the finger movements within a hand, whereas typist 6 kept them relatively independent.

On the basis of this analysis one would expect that typist 3 would not be at a disadvantage when typing 2-finger digraphs such as te, in which both letters occur on the same row. Table 3 compares the trajectories of the left middle finger while typing the digraphs le and te. The major factor related to the longer latencies of typist 3 when typing te was the slow speed of the index finger (45 cm/sec with le versus 70 cm/sec with te). This somewhat puzzling result becomes clear upon examining the typical trajectories shown in Figure 6, which compares the trajectories of the left middle finger while typing the sequences roble and e te.

Table 2
Comparison of typical typings of <u>en</u> and <u>in</u>

Context	Typist 3			Typist 6			
	Latency (msec)	Path Length (cm)	Average Speed (cm/sec)	Latency (msec)	Path Length (cm)	Average Speed (cm/sec)	Path Length Ratio
	I	nterval b	etween stri	king <u>e</u> and	<u>n</u>	·	
calisthenics	106	5.4	51	117	4.1	35	1.3
arguments	96	4.9	51	124	3.4	28	1.4
most beneficial	98	3.9	40	116	2.1	18	1.8
deterrent	108	4.4	41	121	2.5	20	1.8
your entire	101	4.4	44	121	2.8	23	1.6
Average	102	4.6	45	120	3.0	- 25	1.6
Overall <sup>a</sup>	102			121			
	]	nterval b	etween str	iking <u>i</u> and	1 <u>n</u>		
thing	145	6.5	45	109	3.3	30	2.0
things	146	6.6	45	107	3.4	32	1.9
lengthening	148	8.4	57	112	2.7	24	3.1
taking	146	7.5	52	110	3.7	34	2.0
contains	149	9.3	62	113	3.7	33	2.5
but <u>inefficient</u>	152	7.9	52	116	3.4	29	2.3
Average	148	7.7	52	111	3.4	30	2.3

 $<sup>^{\</sup>mathrm{a}}$  Median latency for this digraph for entire session.




Figure 5. Trajectories of the right index fingertip while typing hen (a) in the word calisthenics and hin (b) in the word things. successive points along the paths are 16.7 msec apart. The letters next to some points indicate when the corresponding key was pressed. In the sequence  $\underline{hen}$ , the right index finger presses the  $\underline{h}$  on the home row and then moves down to press the  $\underline{n}$  on the bottom while the  $\underline{e}$  is typed by the left hand. Although typist 3's fingertip traveled a longer path, its speed was greater and the latency for the 2-hand digraph en was shorter than for typist 6. When typist 3 typed hin, however, the right index finger moved up toward the top row along with the right middle finger. while the middle finger struck the i key. Typist 6 was quite different, in that the index finger hardly moved while the middle finger pressed the i on the top row. For typist 3, the coupled movements of the fingers on the left hand resulted in a much longer path length which was not fully compensated for by typist 3's higher finger speed. Thus typist 3 had a longer latency than typist 6 for the 2-finger digraph in.

Table 3 Comparison of typical typings of  $\underline{le}$  and  $\underline{te}$ 

	Typist 3			Typist 6			
Context	Latency (msec)	Path Length (cm)	Average Speed (cm/sec)	Latency (msec)	Path Length (cm)	Average Speed (cm/sec)	Path Length Ratio
	1	nterval b	etween stri	king <u>l</u> and	<u>e</u>		
clearly	116	9.5	82	102	4.2	41	2.3
vegetables	112	7.4	66	113	3.2	28	2.3
detai <u>led</u>	109	6.1	56	116	2.5	22	2.4
problems.	106	9.6	91	111	1.5	13	6.4
moti@nless	110	6.3	57	110	2.6	24	2.4
Average	111	7.8	70	110	2.8	26	3.2
Overall <sup>a</sup>	110			109			
		Interval b	etween str	iking <u>t</u> and	l <u>e</u>		
coun <u>te</u> r,	170	8.9	53	122	3.0	24	3.0
the tempting	165	6.6	40	117	2.5	22	2.6
plate,	164	6.6	40	124	2.3	19	2.9
plate.	171	8.0	47	118	2.0	17	4.0
weight steadily	171	7.3	43	121	2.2	18	3.3
Average Overall <sup>a</sup>	164	7.5	45	120	2.4	19	3.2
Overalla	169			122			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Median latency for this digraph for entire session.




Figure 6. Trajectories of the left middle fingertip while typing roble (a) in the word problems and e te (b) in the words the tempting. The successive points along the paths are 16.7 msec apart. The letters next to some points indicate when the corresponding key was pressed. As in Figure 5, the striking difference was that typist 3's finger movements within a hand were strongly coupled, but typist 6's movements were not. Typist 3's middle finger made large vertical and horizontal movements as the r, b, and t keys were struck by the index finger. Although typist 3's middle finger moved to the bottom row while b was typed, it was moving back to the top row at full speed while 1 was typed by the right hand and the le latency was similar to that for typist 6. In the sequence e te, however, typist 3's middle finger moved down and up as the index finger struck the t and the much longer path length led to a longer latency for the 2-finger digraph te than for typist 6.

In the sequence roble the left index finger typed the  $\underline{r}$  on the top row, the  $\underline{b}$  on the bottom row, and finally the  $\underline{e}$  is typed on the top row by the left middle finger. The  $\underline{o}$  and  $\underline{l}$  are typed by the right hand. Note that typist 3's left middle finger moved in conjunction with the movements of the index finger on the left hand, moving all the way to the bottom row when the index finger typed the  $\underline{b}$ . The le latency was still short, however, since the middle finger was already moving rapidly towards the  $\underline{e}$  key while the  $\underline{l}$  was being typed by the other hand. The performance of typist 6 provides a striking contrast: the middle finger never left the top row while the  $\underline{b}$  was typed.

Although typist 3 did not suffer a latency penalty from the lack of independent movement while typing le, that was not the case for the 2-finger digraph te. In the sequence e te the left middle finger types the e on the top row, the space bar is pressed by the right thumb, then the left index finger types the t on the top row, and finally the left middle finger types the second e. Notice in Figure 6 how typist 3's middle finger moved down to the keyboard as the t was struck by the left index finger. The middle finger then moved up before moving down again to strike the e. In contrast, the middle finger of typist 6 was poised at the top of its arc as the t was struck, and only a short movement was required to strike the e (2.5 cm for typist 6 versus 6.6 cm for typist 3).

It should be noted that typist 3 was faster than typist 6 for some 2-finger digraphs that occur on the same row, such as er and ou. In those cases, typist 3 combined the two keystrokes effectively and typed the two letters with a rolling motion of the hand.

#### Relative Amounts of Hand and Finger Movement

An important correlate of the observed differences between typists 3 and 6 was their different proportions of hand and finger movement in typing. The quantitative measures of finger movement reported above describe the movement of the fingertip relative to the keyboard. This movement can be decomposed into a movement of the hand relative to the keyboard and a movement of the fingertip relative to the hand. Comparing the movements in this way for the sequence hin in the word things showed significant differences between the two typists. For these measurements, the hand position was measured at the point where the right index finger joins the palm (the metacarpophalangeal joint). The position of the fingertip was then measured relative to that point on the hand.

When typist 3 typed the sequence hin, the ratio of finger movement to hand movement was 1.2. The corresponding ratio for typist 6 was 1.8. This contrast was even more striking if we examine the component of the movement in the Y direction (parallel to the keyboard, toward the top or bottom row). Here the ratio of typist 3's hand to finger movement was 1.0, while the ratio for typist 6 was 2.9.

#### Starting and Ending Times of Finger Movements

For a more detailed examination of the typing process, Grudin, Conwsy, and I made a high speed motion picture of typist 6 (see Gentner et al., 1980 for a more detailed presentation). The film has the advantage of greater temporal and spatial resolution than video. The emphasis in this analysis is on when each finger starts its movements.

#### Method

The data reported here are based on a high-speed (100 frames per second) 16mm film of typist 6. The typist transcribed English sentences on the typewriter-like keyboard of a Hazeltine 1500 computer terminal at approximately 90 words/minute. A mirror placed at an angle at the top of the keyboard allowed a second view of the hands to be recorded simultaneously. During the filming, the keypresses and inter-keypress latencies were recorded by the computer.

The film covers 310 keystrokes (about 40 seconds of typing). Becsuse we were primsrily interested in the possibility of overlapping keystrokes, this analysis does not include keystrokes where successive keys were typed by the same finger, since the finger movements were necessarily sequentisl; in addition, the initiation of a movement toward a home row key is ambiguous, as it may simply be a return of the finger to a home position. Therefore, the analysis was restricted to the 147 keystrokes for letters on the upper or lower rows of the keyboard, where the previous keystroke was not made by the same finger.

For each of these keystrokes, the starting and ending times of the keystroke were determined. The time of the keypress, as recorded by the computer, was taken as the ending time of the movement. To determine the starting time of the keystroke, two judges viewed the film frameby-frame on a film editor. The starting time of the keystroke was determined as the time when the finger started a smooth movement toward the key that terminated in the keypress. In slmost all cases, the judges were sble to agree on the starting time of the finger movement. When there was disagreement, the later starting time was used. In two csses, the finger moved toward the key, psused, and then struck the key; the initial starting times were used in these cases. The determination of starting times was greatly sided by the mirror which provided s second view of the fingers in the same frame. This study was actually completed before the videotape study of all six typists reported earlier in this paper. In retrospect it seems that the small hand movements and relatively large independent finger movements of typist 6 made the determination of finger starting times much essier than it would have been for the other typists.

Overlapped Finger Movements

Of the cases studied (keypresses on the upper or lower rows when overlapped movements were possible), 96% of the finger movements were initiated before the previous key was pressed. The mean time for a complete finger movement was 261 msec, while the mean inter-keypress latency was 124 msec. Thus two or three fingers were often in motion simultaneously. Overlapped movements were frequent for both 2-hand digraphs (97% of the time) and 2-finger digraphs (91% of the time). Based on the studies of other typists reported earlier in this paper, however, typist 6 may represent an extreme in ability to overlap within-hand movements.

#### Variability of Starting and Ending Times

If the starting time and ending time of a keystroke are measured relative to the end of the previous keystroke (the keypress), the variability of the starting and ending times can be determined. The starting times of finger movements (standard deviation = 103 msec) were more variable than the ending times (standard deviation = 26 msec). This difference in variability remains even if the context provided by the neighboring letters is controlled. The film included two sentences which were typed twice. Comparing corresponding letters in the repeated sentences, the average difference in starting times was 78 msec, but the average difference in ending times was only 16 msec.

Figure 7 shows the timing of keystrokes for two typings of the phrase an epic. Contrast the irregularity of the initiations of finger movements with the regularity of the keypresses. Also note that keystrokes were sometimes initiated in an order different from the final keypresses. Overall, of the 103 cases where starting times had been determined for successive keystrokes, 21% of the movements were initiated out of order (although the movements always ended with keypresses in the correct order). This happened for sequences of letters occurring both across hands (24% of the time) and within hands (13% of the time). There were several cases where the finger movements were initiated out of order by 150 msec or more. One case of out-of-order initiation, shown in the top portion of Figure 7, extended over two words: in the sequence an epic, the movement to type the e was initiated before the movement to type the n.

Overall, comparing corresponding letters in the repeated sentences, earlier starting times for a movement were not correlated with shorter inter-keypress latencies ( $\mathbf{r}=0.05$ ). An analysis of corresponding keystrokes in the repeated sentences showed that there can be significant variation in the finger's position at the start of the keystroke. In particular, keystrokes that start with the finger closer to the target key were initiated later than keystrokes starting farther away.




Figure 7. Relative timing of keystrokes for the phrase "... an epic tal lines represent the initiation time of the keystrokes, and the right ends of the lines represent the time of the keypresses. Initiation times were not measured for the letter a and the space bar; this is indicated by the dashed lines to the left of the keypress times. Note that successive keypresses were more regularly timed than the corresponding initiations. In two cases, although the keys were pressed in the proper order, the keystrokes were initiated out of order: in the first sentence the e keystroke was initiated before that of n in the previous word; in the second sentence the keystrokes for the word epic were initiated in the order i, e, p, c. (From Gentner, Grudin, & Conway, 1980.)

#### Summary

The inter-keypress latencies of skilled typists when transcribing normal prose were dependent on the digraphs being typed. In general, 1-finger digraphs (such as de, typed by a single finger) were slowest, 2-finger digraphs (such as fe, typed by two fingers on the same hand) were intermediate, and 2-hand digraphs (such as le, typed by fingers on different hands) were fastest. The latencies for 2-finger digraphs were the most variable among typists. For some typists they were like the rapid 2-hand digraphs; for other typists they were like the slow 1-finger digraphs; for the remaining typists, 2-finger digraphs were intermediate in speed. These differences were not always related to overall typing speed. Typists 3 and 6 had the slowest and fastest relative latencies for 2-finger digraphs, but similar overall typing rates.

Analysis of videotapes showed that typist 3 had longer movement trajectories than typist 6, but more than compensated for the longer path by higher finger velocities. When typing 2-finger digraphs, however, typist 3 tended to move all the fingers of a hand in concert, whereas typist 6's fingers moved independently. These independent within-hand movements of typist 6 were associated with shorter latencies for 2-finger digraphs.

Typist 6's finger movements were studied further in a high speed film. Finger movements for successive keypresses overlapped in 96% of the cases where overlap was possible. The timing of the keypresses (the end of the movement) was more regular than the starting times of finger movements, suggesting that the completion of the movement is being controlled rather than its initiation. This was true even when the context was controlled by repeated typing of the same sentence.

These results are in general accord with a computer simulation model of a typist based on distributed control and an interactive relaxation mechanism. To a first approximation, inter-keypress latencies in typing appear to be determined by the geometry of the keyboard and the physical constraints of the hands. There are important individual differences, however, which are not accounted for by these general factors.

There is more than one way to be a skilled typist. Skilled typists show patterns of behavior which were consistent across context and across time, but there were significant differences among typists. Studies of cognitive and motor skills which average across subjects run the risk of obscuring important features of performance.

#### References

- Bayrd, E. The master diet plan--it works! Reader's Digest, March 1979, 163-170.
- Gaines, R. S., Lisowski, W., Press, S. J., & Shapiro, N. Authentication by keystroke timing: Some preliminary results (Tech. Rep. R-2526-NSF). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, May 1980.
- Gentner, D. R., Grudin, J., & Conway, E. Finger movements in transcription typing (Tech. Rept. 8001). La Jolla, Calif.: University of California, San Diego, Center for Human Information Processing, 1980.
- Lashley, K. S. The problem of serial order in behavior. In L. A. Jeffress (Ed.), Cerebral mechanisms in behavior. New York: Wiley, 1951.
- Olsen, R. A., & Murray, R. A., III. Finger motion in typing of texts of varying complexity. Proceedings, 6th Congress of the International Ergonomics Association, July, 1976, 446-450.
- Rumelhart, D. E., & Norman, D. A. Simulating a skilled typist: A study of skilled cognitive-motor performance (Tech. Rep. 8102, CHIP 102). La Jolla, Calif.: University of California, San Diego, Center for Human Information Processing, 1981.
- Shaffer, L. H. Latency mechanisms in transcription. In S. Kornblum (Ed.), Attention and Performance IV. New York: Acedemic Press, 1973.
- Shaffer, L. H. Intention and Performance. <u>Psychological Review</u>, 1976, 83, 375-393.
- Sternberg, S., Monsell, S., Knoll, R. L., & Wright, C. E. The latency and duration of rapid movement sequences: Comparisons of speech and typewriting. In G. E. Stelmach (Ed.), <u>Information processing in motor control and learning</u>. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- Terzuolo, C. A., & Viviani, P. Determinants and characteristics of motor patterns used for typing. Neuroscience, 1980, 5, 1085-1103.

Dr. arthur Bochtach Emwiromentel Atraus Pragras Contat Naval Manical Basevich Institute HatPands, ND 20014

CDR Thomas Hargings NEVAL Benith Homestch Conc. Hon Brage, CA 02052

Bo. Honget Breauc Comm H-[1] MEYTEASQUIPCEN OrlHomm, EL 21812

Chief of Hevel Boucetine Non Fretzing Liene Often Alt Sorre Roben Bonnerce Landretory Flethe fretzing Sovielon Wiltone AFS, AL 85224

He. John Pord METY Personnel Bell Center Hen Bongo, LA A2152

Do. Alchard Glason Patann of Manictae and Pargary Code 3612 Hury bengrraout Machigaron, RC 20372

No. Mency N. Hollf Center for Memor information Processing, C-009 Haiveratty of California, has Beeps La Jolle, Gr. 92093

LT Scoons S. Herris, NRC, USB Code 6051 Havel Air Revelopment Gencar Havelocier, Passeylconis 1907h

lo - Patrinh B. Herrton Paychilgs Coute Befactor Leedership B Ger Bept. 2761 Dristm of Pricestonel Be 6.6. Hert Steden Annengie, MD 21402

Dr. Liepd Hetchench Heben Factors Englandije Hirialon (2022) Havel Air Bavelopment Centet Mercenter, FA 18974

Or. Jie Mollor Many Personnes & & S Lenter San Stage, Ca A7152

Cit Charles w. harching There' Occ.Syrrac Common No 0.8-just hare meastmeer Hectingive, D. 20261

CER Hobert h. Honnedy Mann Performance Science hours Secrepace Mantre: Hasearch Lah Nan 2Pou?

Br. hurmon J. Merv Chief of Havel Technical Training Havel dir Stottom Membhim 1751 Hillighotom, TM 18056

Dr. Willion L. Malny Princing! Civilian Advisor Int Bourstive and Training Hevel Training Command, Comb COA, Principle, FL 32508

Dr. Encels Bacchell Schoetff: Agricor to GCHO(AFT) OFG1T Heshjaton, SC 20270

Gegs, Blondrd L. Hertim, USH Praspective Commending Officer USS Gerl Finess (CMI-70) Heupert Have Beightliding and Drydock Co-Heupert Hane, 7A 21602

Ha. Coorge Maellar Hean, Median Protvos Hapt. Havel Submarjos Maelcal Bosostch Cab Graros, CM (6584)

No. William Montpoor Many Parsonnel S & S Contet Note Dregs, Go 92152

The Rt. |; Sellen Telestel | Distraction Office, Code | 201 Novy Personne| Not George Not Strgm, CA 9/132

Library, Cage P201L Many Personnel Bell Center Han Street, Co. 92152

Tocootcal Directot Many Personnel Ball Conter San Bregs, CA 92:52

Commonding Officer Nevel Mesearch Landitatory Cade 2027 Monthyron, 87 20195

Poyroningtet OND Began b Ofters Sidg 110, Mecros 0 con Summet Syrest Seaton, Mn 02210

Paraoneri & Frateljo Haunarrë Pyngi iCone (16) Bolire of Maval Haunarcë Arlibeton, To 22217

helics of the Oktal of Heval Spotations becomes Semijogenes & Brofine Besseh tuS-165; Weskington, SF. 20150

Gr. Duneld F. Pecker Grownty School of Ructyous Adels. University of Michigan and Schor, NI 48109

Lt. trank C. Perne, MbC, USH 1Pk.05 belorrion and Trateling Stream brv. Benne Patterment Sciences Brpt. Bacal Strengts Medical Securit Lab. Pennecis: 71. 22708

Nuger &. Heatheten, Ph.O. Conv 152 MAREL Pensacolo, FL 32508

De. North Scarlund Stearch, Devalopment, test & Seal-Maral Maxerise and Training Comp 0-5 SAN, Persocuts, fl. 22500

Dr. Non-Schiffset, hT 721 States Englanette Test Directorate U.h. Macel Str Test Center Petswent Siver, ND 20470

Dr. Bowlet G. Smith Office of Chief of Mavel Operations up-9876 Weshigeron, DC 20230

Br. Alfres P. Smode Tructing obelysts & Svelserlon Orosp 178507 Dept. of thi Mary Orlando, FL 12813

Enger Hotestager-Beyloo Hept, of Adate Sciences Hevel Feergreever Science Homistey, CA 41940

So. Herier Viener Comm 109 Navy Peranovol BeD Center Hem Strage, Ga 92152

He John E. Unile Come Pilo U. S. Have Personnel Massatth & Drealspeet Center See Bregs, CA 92:52

TerMijesi Director

Oih. Arby Beseith Jestitute für ims
Bekentral mei Social Sciences
SUU hreshbuer des.
Alscamacie, Ps. 22235

Ho, J. HarPar HGS, Hangstower of tPs Army DAPK-ZDE Westington, SC 20318

No. Bearring J. Pacr 8.5. Arms Becommit Englishes 5001 Steenhoust Ave. Alexborts, Vd. 32123

hp. Dustet Fletcher 8.5. Army BoscortS Institute 5001 Steshover Ave. Ajackseris, es 2233)

he. Hichnel Hagion 6.6. Army Beenston Institute 500| Sincolumny evense Ajastosrio, 7A 22333 ho. Hilton S. Mata Tratelas Tochilcal Area U.S. Army Asserts Institute 5001 Stanhourr Ave. Alexandrie, FA 22323

Dr. Mareld P. O'Mail, Jr. Acce: PERF-OH Army Bounerth Institute 5001 Steenhower Ave. Alecandria, Pa 22222

LTC Hitchesi Siumer Chief, Lendsching & Organizational BiEnctivenson lovyalse Office of the Report Chief of Sculf Jac Patpoints! Rept. of the Amy! Pencyan, Meebigs on EC 20301

br. Subert Sommer G. S. Army Secontrol Institute for the Suberletgi and Decial Science 5001 Slowshout Areas Alexandria, VA 25335

Als Porce

Air Solveralty SoStary ASL/LEE 70/ME3 Monanii AFE, AL 26113

So. Mari A. Aliezel NG. AFMEL (AFSC) Novela AFS, TE 78235

ho. Gourvieve Maddet Prheron Menager Lafe Halonces Seroctutete AFORM Belling AFB, SC 20232

to. Sonald G. Hagton AFRE/079 01311000 AFE, AE 65224

No. Sylvia S. Hayer 170|6| No Slocttonic Systems Mivision Masser AFE Amestd, No. 02173

br. Herry Sectiony Technical Serector AFMAL(No.2 Villiano AFS, Al 30234

tr. Sroot Schillstowell 0.5. Air Petra atc/EPTD Randwigh APE, TX 76140

b. MYIllon Groomsp Bouration Advisor (\$031) Bouration Genter, MESSC Question, Po 32134

| Special Addition for Marion Grape Mattera Cade (600 | helias of Maon; Research 800 6. Quicy by Arlington, VA 28317

No. A-L. Stellondy Sciencitic Maries (Code MD-1) MG, N-S. Macree Gorng Mashington, NL 20180

Chief, Peyr<sup>AS</sup> the Scal Money's Manoch S. S. Comer Guard (G-P-1/2/TF42) Membl<sub>Be</sub>tun, DC 20592

DoPet Dod 12 Delene Technical Information Center Cameron Stellen, bidg. 5 Alexhorte, V6 2211C httm: TC

Military Maintaut for Training and Paracount Technology Office of CA Under Materary of Defend-tor Receive & Engiveering Roses 5012A, The Passegom Weekingson, SC 20301

Civil Covt

Br. Posan Chrosen Learning and Breslephent heatlone: Institute of Laucetine 1200 19th Street Ma Weshington, DL. 20208

will toe J. McLeurin seblu moute Lourt isep springs, ND 20011

Be. Arthur Melant Marienel Intitute of Bowretton 1700 19th Street Me Heshigeron, SC 20208

Dr. Andre S. Heloer Science Bourstles Dav-end Meserch Hatlenel Science Pumodation Heabington, SC 20530

Dr. Joseph Peorpe Natione: Teritate of Education 1200 | 9th St. Ma Manhigaton, SC 2020K

Nr. h. Nations htms/ No. 1876. Pingross Streeter Pingross Streeter Managers Bereszel and Majonry Bervices Sattheosise Invitation 801 Parch Pitt Scient AlmonStree, Va 22314

Dr. Frank Withrom 5. S. Office of Macaclon situ Maryland ave. Be Wesbingroe, SC 20202

SP. Joseph L. Young, Bursecon Homory & Cogniries Processon Entined Science Posedation Weshington, M. 20530

Non Cont

Dr. John S. Andress Grpt. ol Paychology (Arcogia Mailes Untvetelty Ptttchurgh, Pe 1521)

Neotroot, Thomas 6., Th.8 Greter loc tils btofy of Stofing 1% Children v Maserch Lentec 51 Gerts Noise Chemostge, IL 11820

Dr. John Minett Drpt. ot Payrfology Holveretty of Merwick Connetry C94 7at. Logland

No. Hichael Atwood Science Applications Institute 40 Nerver Tech, Genter West 7923 S. Frentice No. Englawood, 00 B0110

i Payritigatel Besetch Belt Dryt. of Defense (Army Offica) Cospecil Park Offices Commerce ACT 2800, Avertalia

Dr. S.A. Anner University of 11110n1s Counter-heard Bosestions; Bosesch UrPave, 11. 61801

its Alon Meddelop Hedical Newberd Council Applies Payerbings Not 15 Chescar No. Contrides CD7 227 England

No. Possiste Suggest hops, of Popresingy Notwentsy of Honors Holystolic Perh. Notweet CO 80208

No. Jonathan Baron Hapt, of Payentingy Halvereity of Panasylvania 3613-15 Salont St. 1-2 Philadelphia: PA 10104

Mn Auton Borr Department of Computer Scientists Mniversity Scottord, LA Passi

Dr. Jocheno Bustry Dengroser of Payentingy Holverstry of GAlifornia Con Angelon, Ga 90024

Dr. John Hetgen behnes of Boweston University of Attions Tuncon AE 83771

LUB Soher; J. Siprover Program Honoges Nation Posternama Mary Soffice 200 Game Socheede, MB 20014

Liston belongists belies of Money Species Franch belies, London Ann 39 Ffo Ma Both 89516 He. Lyla Bourse behatteent of Poychology Selvergity of Guistode heeldet, 00 80109

Col. May Soving 800 S. Quiltop Dr. Ross 806 Arlington, VA 22211

Dr. John S. Bonne EEROR Polo Alto Honoarch Grotor 3333 Gayara Road Polo Alto, Go PolGo

be. Store Buchless Separtment of Computer Scte Seminted Daivarnity Stanford, Ge PalUS

Br. C. Pictor Honderone WIGAT INC. Belvercity Place Sujre 10 1160 MG. State Sc. Oros, UT Beu57

Dr. Anthony Gence||1| School of Bearerlon Sotvereity of eticone Tveron, Al 55721 Dr. Per Larnguter Bept. of Payentingy Carnegio-hailon Hetvaretty Fitteburgh, PA 15212

br. John h. Carroll PsycHometric Lab Univ. of Po. Carolina Davie Poli 013A Chapel hill. Mr. 2751A

Charine Myare Library Living Cross House Lising Views Head Strail and London 215 2LJ EMCGNID

Do. viillas Chase Dopt - at Paycholasy Carregto Moiles University PitteMirgh, PA 15212

he- HisPalles Chi Lennolog B & D Centre Heliustery of Pilitaburgh 2010 O'Mara httro; Piccaburgh, PA 15213

Or. Francate G. Chafeton Patroptronics 0231 Teriol Ave. woodings Milis, Gr 01267

Dr. Align H. Grilles Hult Harmook & Hamman, Inc. 30 Montron Street Conhetdge, Ho 102138

No. Lynn e. Comper Genc Matversity of Pittoburgh 3010 O'mare Sc. Pttroburgh, PA 15213

Thomas L. Craffell 25 Lewite Avenue Comfile, NY 13745

Dr. Heraditä P. Crawford Banricon PayrPulgaical Mancietion 1200 13th Street, H.M. Beshigaton, SC 20036

Dr. Honneth S. Ctoss onecong Sciences, Inc. P.O. Drews () Hente BerPare, CA 93102

No. Ambanvel Donchin Dengtonot of Poychiloge Naiveratty of Hillsole Channelow, 11 51820 Do. Holbert Draylve Depertment of Philosophy Bolverbity of Gelliornia SerBolay, Ge 94720

LCOL J. C. Aggenberger Structurate of Personnel Applied | Believe | Before | Ng (O) Grison | Sy betwee Datese, Greede | Bla OKS

URIC Facility-Acquisitions 4832 Rugby Armone Mathemate, ND 20014

No. A. J. bacMoStonner Nape. \$422, 81ds. 81 ReBonnell Bougles Mattomentics Co. F.O.Sob 516 Sc. Boute, MD 63166

Dr. Id Folgenhous Dept. of Computer Science Stanford Setveroley Scoolard, LA 94305

Mr. Pollven Postuntg Bolt Meraveb & Memman, 2nc. 50 Memicon St. Combridge, Mr. 02130 hs. Bovis A. Flatahman Advanced Bessard Memorces Organ. Helte 900 4330 Seat Peaf Nighteep Menhington, DC 20014

Br. Jone B. Sollay, Jr. Appline Bolances Mesociates Inc. Yelencia, Po. 1605A

Hn. John R. Priteritum Hnjt Betsoch & Beumen 30 Ameteun Strong Confiridge, No. 12(26

No. Allodo Filedous Nept. of PayerGliny Neiverally of Alberts Education, Almerts Connel 785 JS9

in. 8. Monerd Columient Sept. of Paychilagy Hoistraity of Collifornia hom Angelon, Co 80024

br. Bobort Glosov LASC Holversity of Pictoburgh 2019 S Hoto St. Pilloburgs, FA 15213

le. Morvin d. Gloch 21 2 Stone Molf Cornell Molverelty (cPace, SY 18852 No. From E. Gomet McBotnej) Rogeles Sectomencies Co. F. G. Bon 51A Sc. Annes, NO A31No

" vale "REVERS PRO ME, as as no " " " " "

Dr. Bertel Cepher
Indvertel & Hanngement Englventing
Teconics-Israel Justicute of Technology
Intelligation

Dr. James G. Gresco LASC American Piccoburgh
Hotvorolty of Piccoburgh
1959 O'Hero Street
PictorStah, Po 15212

Br. Harold Hawkies Department at Perchillagy Halverstr of Oregon Regare of 9/402

Dr. Joses S. Haffman Drpt. of Peychology Hajveratts of Halavero Havech, Mt. 17711

Ginude Errowerth, "A. "Number Entwictgroce Sewelletter" P.O. Boy 1162 SiruigeNes, Hi 48012

Dr. Berl heet Bept. of Peychilege Belvereity of Heehigeton Seatrie, He 98015

ho. Scaves W. Basis Dapt. of Paychilagy Holwesity of Colorada Boulder, NO 80302 he sect Alexas Sept. of Peychtingy Selversity of Arisona Tuscon, AZ 85121

Dr. Maitar Eletech Bept. of Peycholgey Bolvetelly of Gelorate Soutder, CO 80302

Dr. Benosth A. Elivineton Principae Officac Alires P. Bloom Foundation 430 FtfcS Ave. Ubs Nort, NY 10111

Dr. Stephen Hossiyn Berward Holwersity Bengtment of Paychethey 22 Alraises Sc. Cambridge, Ma 02138

Mr. Mortin Krheer 1117 Fin Goleto Palno Merdon Estaton, Co. 80274

br. Jill tathin hopt. of Payenting Carmedo Moiles Heiwateltp Ficiaburgh, Pa. 13213

ho, Alon Legacid Legacity B & 8 Genter Motocraity of Pittoburgs Piccoburgs, PA 15240 he. Hichkel Lavice 210 hercatics Paffdine helwarmity of Ellienia Champeign, th. 51520

So. Mark Miller TJ Committer Science Lambratory C/O 2824 Winterplyon Citeta Pisso, TS 75075

he. Allen Hance Benkvtorel Techningy Landreteries 1845 Elses one., Poutch Plear Assends Brock, Cr 902 27

lo. Haymour A. Pangtt HannerGassic Inefficies of Technello y Accificial Intelligeven Leh 365 Technollo y Square Cambridge, Me 02136

Do. Jones A. Poulson Partiens State Helvecolfy P.O. Boy 751 Pattland, OK 97207 he. James W. Poliperios haiveratty of Gel22crain, heats bethers heats of Paychille? heats herpars, Ge 92106

Mr. Luigi Petrolio 2421 D. Reguvood Brreat Arligatoo, 9A 22207

to Steven & Political Sept. of Paychilogy Holostolity of Moover Server, 00 80208

No. Fred hell SESAME 4/6 Physica Sept. Okliverstry of Gellformid Sechely, GA 94720

Memory H. Mese Econ Institute for Bussarch 5 Thomas Jelferene Br. My htmoren, BC 20002

ho. Weller Schonider Dept. of PayrPather Scivetally of Illicols Champelge, SL 61620

Countttoe on Cagaltive Bosonych 7/o No. Lounis 5. Shetted Social Stience Hosserch Council 805 Third Ave. New York, NY [80] A

Befort he Binglet Manactate Prolonour Gernagta-Mollon Hatvorolly Bopt. of Post-Milbay Bi Panilay Park Piccaburgh, Po. 13213

Hn. Laverd Mitch Buit, Byzanet & Hraman, 30 Hemiten 50. Cambilder, No. 02710

In. Bobert Mitth Dengtheret of leapurer Scienc Buigare University New Stunesics, bj UB9//

No. Blonked Snow School of Education brooferd Holveratty binelard, LA 96305 Or. Bobert Scanning Late, of Pay-Mingr date University Bow 11a, Yole Sturive Naw Mavon, CT 06520

Do- AlPAct Drovens Helt Berovek & Naubon 30 Moniton hrrows Combeldge, No. U2158

he. Thumse G. Helcht Birectot, heart Saille Brytelon athums; 100 h. Menhington https: Alexandria, 76 22316

Unvid 8. Scoon, Ph.S. Marcitise Corngration 2460 Std Springhouse PE. McLeon, TA 22162

No. Patrick Suppos ineritute for Mathematical Schäles to the Social Sciences Scenfard Matematry Scenfard Matematry Scenfard Febbs

No. Ethon Totaucha Congar Botton Bouration Beneard Labourery 232 Engineering Bonearch Landresory Betweetty of 1121cols Urbau, 11 5801

Ho. Pacey Thorndyke The Band Corp. 1700 Hejo St. Penty Homits, Go \$0406

Deart months to the fine forms for the fine forms for the first forms forms forms for first forms for first forms for first forms for forms for first fo

Br. Borton J. Underwood Bapt- ol PaycPoingy Hordwastern University Eveneties, EL 86201

he. Paylite Menuer Graduate Setteni of Education Merverd University 200 Geromo Melf, Appton May Combridge, No. 02130 Hn. Mactd J. Meles 8500 Ellintt Poll Helveletty of Riomesoto 25 h. Siver MG. Hiomesolis. Mb. 35455

Br. Coretton Mojtone Parceptrosica Inc. Al Il Farial Are. Woodlings Hills, CA Alia

Ha. Beigh T. Pascout! Ivintmarton Sciencew Hate The Bent Corporation | 750 Main By. Heata Hamica, Gr 90865.

le. Christopher Michies Bept. of Peychology Belveralty of Illtools Champeige, IL 61820

#### CHIP Technical Report List

- David M. Green and William J. McGill. On the equivalence of detection probabilities and well known statistical quantities. October, 1969.
- 2. Donald A. Norman. Comments on the information structure of memory. October, 1969.
- 3. Norman H. Anderson. Functional measurement and psychophysical judgment. October, 1969.
- James C. Shanteau. An additive decision-making model for sequential estimation and inference judgments. October, 1969.
- 5. Norman H. Anderson. Averaging model applied to the size-weight illusion. October, 1969.
- 6. Norman H. Anderson and James C. Shanteau. Information integration in risky decision making. November, 1969.
- George Mandler, Richard H. Meltzer, Zena Pearlstone. The structure of recognition. Effects of list tags and of acoustic and semantic confusion. November, 1969.
- 8. Dominic W. Massaro. Perceptual processes and forgetting in memory tasks. January, 1970.
- 9. Daniel Graboi. Searching for targets: The effects of specific practice. February, 1970.
- James H. Patterson and David M. Green. Discrimination of transient signals having identical energy spectra. February, 1970.
- 11. Donald A. Norman. Remembrance of things past. June, 1970.
- 12. Norman H. Anderson. Integration theory and attitude change. August, 1970.
- A.D. Baddeley and J.R. Ecob. Reaction time and short-term memory: A trace strength alternative to the highspeed exhaustive scanning hypothesis. November, 1970.
- 14. A.D. Baddeley. Retrieval rules and semantic coding in short-term memory. December, 1970.
- 15. Roy D. Patterson. Residue pitch as a function of the number and relative phase of the component sinusoids. March, 1971.
- George Mandler and Marilyn A. Borges. Effects of list differentiation, category membership and prior recall on recognition. May, 1971.
- 17. David E. Rumelhart, Peter H. Lindsay, and Donald A. Norman. A process model for long-term memory. May, 1971.
- 18. David E. Rumelhart and Adele A. Abrahamson. Toward a theory of analogical reasoning. July, 1971.
- 19. Martin F. Kaplan. How response dispositions integrate with stimulus information. August, 1971.
- Martin F. Kaplan and Norman H. Anderson. Comparison of information integration and reinforcement models for interpersonal attraction. August, 1971.
- 21. David M. Green and R. Duncan Luce. Speed-accuracy tradeoff in auditory detection. September, 1971.
- 22. David E. Rumelhart. A multicomponent theory of confusion among briefly exposed alphabetic characters.

  November, 1971.
- 23. Norman H. Anderson and Arthur J. Farkas. New light on order effects in attitude change. March, 1972.
- 24. Norman H. Anderson. Information integration theory: A brief survey. April, 1972.
- 25. Donald A. Norman. Memory, knowledge, and the answering of questions. May, 1972.
- Pavid J. Weiss. Averaging: An empirical validity criterion for magnitude estimation. Norman H. Anderson. Cross-task validation of functional measurement. June, 1972.
- 27. David E. Rumelhart and Patricia Siple. The process of recognizing tachistoscopically presented words.

  August, 1972.
- 28. Ebbe B. Ebbesen and Richard Bowers. The effects of proportion of risky to conservative arguments in a group discussion on risky shift. September, 1972.
- 29. Ebbe B. Ebbesen and Michael Haney. Flirting with death: Variables affecting risk taking on our nation's highways. September, 1972.
- 30. Norman H. Anderson. Algebraic models in perception. November, 1972.
- Norman H. Anderson. Cognitive algebra: Information integration applied to social attribution. December, 1972.
- Jean M. Mandler and Nancy L. Stein. Recall recognition of pictures by children as a function of organization and of distractor similarity. January, 1973.
- 33. David E. Rumelhart and Donald A. Norman. Active semantic networks as a model of human memory. Marc Eisenstadt and Yaakov Kareev. Towards a model of human game playing. June, 1973.
- 34. George Mandler. Memory storage and retrieval: Some limits on the reach of attention and consciousness. July, 1973.
- 35. Kent L. Norman. A method of maximum likelihood estimation for stimulus integration theory. August, 1973.

Marketalanalista

- 36. Yaakov Kareev. A model of human game playing. August, 1973.
- 37. Donald A. Norman. Cognitive organization and learning. August, 1973.
- 38. The Center for Human Information Processing: A Five Year Report 1968-73.

- 39. Larry D. Rosen and J. Edward Russo. Binary processing in multi-alternative choice. October, 1973.
- Samuel Himmelfarb and Norman H. Anderson. Integration theory analysis of opinion attribution. December, 1973.
- 41. George Mandler. Consciousness: Respectable, useful, and probably necessary. March, 1974.
- 42. Norman H. Anderson. The problem of change-of-meaning. June, 1974.
- 43. Norman H. Anderson. Methods for studying information integration. June, 1974.
- 44. Norman H. Anderson. Basic experiments in person perception. June, 1974.
- 45. Norman H. Anderson. Algebraic models for information integration. June, 1974.
- 46. Ebbe B. Ebbesen and Vladimir J. Konečni. Cognitive algebra in legal decision making. September, 1974.
- 47. Norman H. Anderson. Equity judgments as information integration.

  Arthur J. Farkas and Norman H. Anderson. Input summation and equity summation in multi-cue equity judgments.

  December, 1974.
- 48. George Mandler and Arthur Graesser 11. Dimensional analysis and the locus of organization. January, 1975.
- 49. James L. McClelland. Preliminary letter identification in the perception of words and nonwords. April, 1975.
- Donald A. Norman and Daniel G. Bobrow. On the role of active memory processes in perception and cognition. May, 1975.
- J. Edward Russo. The value of unit price information. An information processing analysis of point-of-purchase decisions. June, 1975.
- 52. Elissa L. Newport. Motherese: The speech of mothers to young children. August, 1975.
- Norman H. Anderson and Cheryl C. Graesser. An information integration analysis of attitude change in group discussion. September, 1975.
- Lynn A. Cooper. Demonstration of a mental analog of an external rotation.
   Lynn A. Cooper and Peter Podgorny. Mental transformations and visual comparison processes: Effects of complexity and similarity. October, 1975.
- 55. David E. Rumelhart and Andrew Ortony. The representation of knowledge in memory. January, 1976.
- 56. David E. Rumelhart. Toward an interactive model of reading. March, 1976.
- 57. Jean M. Mandler, Nancy S. Johnson, and Marsha DeForest. A structural analysis of stories and their recall: From "Once upon a time" to "Happily ever after". March, 1976.
- 5B. David E. Rumelhart. Understanding and summarizing brief stories. April, 1976.
- 59. Lynn A. Cooper and Roger N. Shepard. Transformations on representations of objects in space. April, 1976.
- 60. George Mandler. Some attempts to study the rotation and reversal of integrated motor patterns. May, 1976.
- 61. Norman H. Anderson. Problems in using analysis of variance in balance theory. June, 1976.
- 62. Norman H. Anderson. Social perception and cognition. July, 1976.
- David E. Rumelhart and Donald A. Norman. Accretion, tuning and restructuring: Three modes of learning. August, 1976.
- 64. George Mandler. Memory research reconsidered: A critical view of traditional methods and distinctions. September, 1976.
- Norman H. Anderson and Michael D. Klitzner. Measurement of motivation.
   Michael D. Klitzner and Norman H. Anderson. Motivation x expectancy x value: A functional measurement approach. November, 1976.
- 66. Vladimir J. Konečni. Some social, emotional, and cognitive determinants of aesthetic preference for melodies in complexity. December, 1976.
- 67. Hugh Mehan, Courtney B. Cazden, LaDonna Coles, Sue Fisher, Nick Maroules. The social organization of classroom lessons. December, 1976.
- 67a. Hugh Mehan, Courtney B. Cazden, LaDonna Coles, Sue Fisher, Nick Maroules. Appendices to the social organization of classroom lessons. December, 1976.
- 68. Norman H. Anderson. Integration theory applied to cognitive responses and attitudes. December, 1976.
- Norman H. Anderson and Diane O. Cuneo. The height + width rule in children's judgments of quantity. June, 1977.
   Norman H. Anderson and Clifford H. Butzin. Children's judgments of equity. June, 1977.
- 70. Donald R. Gentner and Donald A. Norman. The FLOW tutor: Schemas for tutoring. June, 1977.
- George Mandler. Organization and repetition: An extension of organizational principles with special reference to rote learning. May, 1977.
- 72. Manuel Leon. Coordination of intent and consequence information in children's moral judgements. August, 1977.
- 73. Ted Supalla and Elissa L. Newport. How many seats in a chair? The derivation of nouns and verbs in American Sign Language. November, 1977.
- Donald A. Norman and Daniel G. Bobrow. Descriptions: A basis for memory acquisition and retrieval. November, 1977.

- 75. Michael D. Williams. The process of retrieval from very long term memory. September, 1978.
- 76. Jean M. Mandler. Categorical and schematic organization in memory. October, 1978.
- 77. James L. McClelland. On time relations of mental processes: A framework for analyzing processes in cascade.
  October, 1978.
- 78. Jean M. Mandler and Marsha DeForest. Developmental invariance in story recall. November, 1978. Jean M. Mandler, Sylvia Scribner, Michael Cole, and Marsha DeForest. Cross-cultural invariance in story recall. November, 1978.
- 79. David E. Rumelhart. Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. December, 1978.
- 80. Nancy S. Johnson and Jean M. Mandler. A tale of two structures: Underlying and surface forms in stories.


  January, 1979.
- 81. David E. Rumelhart. Analogical processes and procedural representations. February, 1979.
- 82. Ross A. Bott. A study of complex learning: Theory and methodologies. March, 1979.
- 83. Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition. Toward a unified approach to problems of culture and cognition. May, 1979.
- 84. George Mandler and Lawrence W. Barsalou. Steady state memory: What does the one-shot experiment assess? May, 1979.
- 85. Norman H. Anderson. Introduction to cognitive algebra. June, 1979.
- Edited by Michael Cole, Edwin Hutchins, James Levin and Naomi Miyake. Naturalistic problem solving and microcomputers. Report of a Conference. June, 1979.
- 87. Donald A. Norman. Twelve issues for cognitive science. October, 1979.
- 88. Donald A. Norman. Slips of the mind and an outline for a theory of action. November, 1979.
- 89. The Center for Human Information Processing: A Description and a Five-Year Report (1974-1979). November, 1979.
- 90. Michael Cole and Peg Griffin. Cultural amplifiers reconsidered. December, 1979.
- 91. James L. McClelland and David E. Rumelhart. An interactive activation model of the effect of context in perception. Part 1. April, 1980.
- 92. James L. McClelland and J.K. O'Regan. The role of expectations in the use of peripheral visual information in reading. February, 1980.
- 93. Edwin Hutchins. Conceptual structures of Caroline Island navigation. May, 1980.
- 94. Friedrich Wilkening and Norman H. Anderson. Comparison of two rule assessment methodologies for studying cognitive development. June, 1980.
- 95. David E. Rumelhart and James L. McClelland. An interactive activation model of the effect of context in perception. Part 11. August, 1980.
- 96. Jean M. Mandler. Structural invariants in development. September, 1980.
- 97. David E. Rumelhart and Donald A. Norman. Analogical processes in learning. October, 1980.
- 98. James A. Levin and Yaakov Kareev. Personal computers and education: The challenge to schools. November, 1980.
- Donald A. Norman and Tim Shallice. Attention to action: Willed and automatic control of behavior. December, 1980.
- 100. David E. Rumelhart. Understanding understanding. January, 1981.
- 101. George Mandler. The structure of value: Accounting for taste. May, 1981.
- 102. David E. Rumelhart and Donald A. Norman. Simulating a skilled typist: A study of skilled cognitive-motor performance. May, 1981.
- 103. Jean M. Mandler. Representation. June, 1981.
- 104. Donald R. Gentner. Skilled Finger Movements in Typing. July, 1981.

Note: Requests for CHIP reports should be addressed to the author. Reports are also available through the Library Loan Service of the University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093.

# END

# DATE FILMED OF STREET

DTIC



Note: Requests for CHIP reports should be addressed to the author. Reports are also available through the Library Loan Service of the University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093.

## DTIC